MAY 2 8 7002 Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box -> +

Signature

TRANSMITTAL	•
FORM	

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Applicati n Numb r 09/017,959

Filing Dat February 3, 1998 RECE VED

First Named Invent r David A. Bernhardt

Group Art Unit 3711

Examiner Name William M. Pierce TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

Date

May 21, 2002

Total Number of Page	s in This Submission	Attorn	ey Docket Number	8117-000021		
		ENCLOSURES	(check all that apply)			
Fee Transmittal Form		Assignment Papers (for an Application)		After Allowance Communication to Group		
Fee Attached		☐ Drawing(s)		Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences		
Amendment / Re	Amendment / Response			Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)		
After Final		Petition		Proprietary Information	on	
Affidavits/dec	claration(s)	Petition to Conv Provisional App		Status Letter		
Extension of Time	e Request		Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address Other Enclo (please identifi		The manager production of support	
		Terminal Discla	Terminal Disclaimer Reply Brief			
Express Abandor	nment Request	Request for Ref	und			
Information Discl	osure Statement	CD, Number of	CD(s)		: // / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /	
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		Remarks	additional fees that n	s hereby authorized to ch nay be required under 37 do. 08-0750. A duplicate (CFR 1.16 or 1.17	
Response to Miss Incomplete Applie			•	RE	CEIVED	
Response to Parts under 3 1.52 or 1.53				MA	Y 3 0 2002	
	SIGNA	TURE OF APPLIC	ANT, ATTORNEY, O	R AGENT TECHNOL	OGY CENTER R3	
Firm <i>or</i> Individual name	Harness, Dickey &	Pierce, P.L.C.	orney Name B. Duke Taylor	Reg. No. 31,306		
Signature	W.K	W				
Date	May 21, 2002					
	C	ERTIFICATE OF N	AILING/TRANSMISS	SION		
I hereby certify that the addressed to: Common Trademark Office on	nissioner of Patents a	and Trademarks, Wasl	the United States Posta hington, D.C. 20231, or to	al Service as first class mail acsimile transmitted to the	in an envelope U.S. Patent and	
Typed or printed nam						
	1	/ / 1 / /		district .	· ·	

FEE	TRA	NSN	IITT	AL
1	or F	Y 20	02	

Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

Complete if Known Application Number 09/017,959 February 3, 1998 Filing Date First Named Inventor David A. Bernhardt **Examiner Name** William M. Pierce Group / Art Unit 3711 TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT 140 8117-000021 Attorney Docket No.

	M	ETHOD O	F PAYM	ENT (check all	that apply)					FEE C	ALCULATION (continued)	
⊠ Chec	. □	Credit on	rd 🗆	Monoy 🗖 🔾	ther \square No		3. AD	DITIONAL	L FEES	Consti		
M CHEC	~ ⊔	Credit card Money Other None Order				Large Entity		Small Entity				
	Deposit Account:				Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Pald		
Dep Acc					105	130	205	65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath			
Num		08-0/30					127	50	227	25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet.	
Dep	nsit							130	139	130	Non-English specification	
Acc		Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.				147	2,520	147	2,520	For filing a request for reexamination		
Nam							112	920*	112	920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
Char	Commissioner is authorized to: (check all that apply) Charge fee(s) indicated below Credit any overpayments Charge any additional fee(s) during the pendency of this application						113	1,840*	113	1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action	
				except for the		application	115	110	215	55	Extension for reply within first month	
		ntified de	oosit acc	ount.			116	400	216	200	Extension for reply within second month	
			FEE CA	ALCULATION			117	920	217	460	Extension for reply within third month	
1. E Large	BASIC FI	ILING FE Small	E Entity				118	1,440	218	720	Extension for reply within fourth month	7
Fee	Fee	Fee	Fee	Fee Descriptio	n		128	1,960	228	980	Extension for reply within fifth month	
Code	(\$)	Code	(\$)			Fee Paid	119	320	219	160	Notice of Appeal	
101	740	201		Utility filing fee	L.		120	320	220	160	Filing a brief in support of an appeal	
106	330	206		Design filing fee	·		121	280	221	140	Request for oral hearing	140
107 108	510 740	207 208		Plant filing fee Reissue filing fe	e		138	1,510	138	1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding	
114	160	214	80	Provisional filling	g fee		140	110	240	55	Petition to revive - unavoidable	
							141	1,280	241	640	Petition to revive - unintentional	
		SL	BTOTAL	_ (1)		(\$) 0	142	1,280	242	640	Utility issue fee (or reissue)	
2. FXT	RA CLAI	M FEES					143	460	243	230	Design issue fee	
_, _,,,,				Extra F	Fee from	Fee	144	620	244	310	Plant issue fee	
			_	Claims b	pelow	Paid	122	130	122	130	Petitions to the Commissioner	
otal Clair	=	20	** = [<u> </u>	=	= 0	123	50	123	50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17 (q)	,
depender laims	nt	-3	** =	o x	=	= 0	126	180	126	180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
ultiple ependent				x [0	581	40	581	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
Large Fee	Entity Fee	Fee	Entity Fee	/ Fee Descrip	tion		146	740	246	370	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(a))	
Code 103	(\$)	Code 203	(\$) 9	•			149	740	249	370	For each additional invention to be	
103	18 84	203	9 42	Claims in exc		occ of 2					examined (37 CFR § 1.129(b))	
104	280	202	140	Independent Multiple depe			179	740	279	370	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	
					dependent claim,	•	169	900	169	900	Request for expedited examination	<u> </u>
109	84	209	42	original pater		~*************************************	1.03	300	109	900	of a design application (7)	
110	18	210	9	** Reissue cla over original	aims in exces patent	ss of 20 and	}					
			SU	JBTOTAL (2)	(\$) 0		Other f	ee (specif	y)	_		

SUBMITTED BY		Cor	nplete (if applicable)
Name (Print/Type)	W. R. Duke ayor Registration to Attorney/Agent) 31,306	Telephone	(248) 641-1600
Signature	W.1C.(V)	Date	May 21, 2002

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be Included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231.

DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

MAY 2 8 2002

N THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Group Art:

3711

Examiner:

William M. Pierce

Applicant:

David A. Bernhardt

REPLY BRIEF

Serial No.:

09/017,959

Filed:

February 3, 1998

For:

BOWLING BALL FINGER GRIP

RECEIVED

MAY 3 0 2002

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

Dear Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer, please consider the following.

Applicant respectfully requests an Oral Hearing and encloses the requisite fee under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(d) in the amount of \$140.00.

The Examiner continues to misapply the two prong tests set forth in <u>In Re Paulsen</u> 31 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1671 at 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1994). The Court stated that

"a rejection for anticipation under §102 requires that each and every limitation of the claimed invention be disclosed in a single prior art reference. <u>In re Spada</u>, 911 F.2d 705, 708 15 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1655, 1657 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In addition, the reference must be enabling and describe the Applicant's claimed invention sufficiently to have placed it in possession of a person or ordinary skill in the filed of the invention." <u>Id</u>.

The Examiner has failed to show that the Stevens reference having its pointed projections in any way disclose anything other than brushing teeth. It neither discloses nor suggests projections with the desired configurations such that the tips of the projections define a curve which has a curvature substantially like the curvature of a bowling ball when force is exerted by a bowler on the ball. The Examiner suggests that it is inherent that Stevens shows these features. Clearly this is not the case. In re Weiss 26 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1993) at 1888 the court

stated:

"the mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient (to establish inherency)..." (which requires that) the disclosure is sufficient to show that the natural result flowing from the operation as taught would result in the performance of the questioned function....

Here the Examiner is misapplying Stevens since its disclosure, or lack of it, only discloses a tooth brush. Stevens shows brushing teeth and does not teach the result of applying spin on a bowling ball. Thus, Stevens does not inherently disclose Applicant's invention.

With respect to the second part of the test, Stevens is not sufficient to have placed Applicant's invention in possession of a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention. The Examiner states that the field of the invention is finger cots. Applicant has attached a print out from Dictionary.com which indicates that no entries were found for the term "finger cot". A further search on Yahoo illustrates that finger cots are for handling small parts and for protecting delicate parts from salts and oils associated with the skin. The finger cots are illustrated as very thin latex members, they have no projecting members. The Examiner alleges that the problem at hand is improving grip and protecting the fingers and not bowling per se. Clearly this is incorrect. As stated in Applicant's application, the purpose of the finger grip is to inpart spin onto the bowling ball. Not for protection as alleged by the Examiner. Further the claims are directed to bowling accessories and finger grips. In fact, no where has the Examiner brought forth any reference illustrating a finger cot which a bowler has used to protect his fingers or improved grip. Thus, the Examiner's argument is flawed with error.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's anticipation rejection is improper.

The Examiner has failed to provide a reference which meets both parts of the above identified

test. Accordingly, Applicant believes Claims 17 through 28 to be patentable over the cited art and respectfully requests allowance of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 21, 2002

W. R. Duke Taylor

Reg. No. 31306

Attorneys for Applicant

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. Box 828 Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303 (248) 641-1600

WRDT/jp Enclosure

Attorney Docket No. 8117-000021



Look up: finger cots

Search: Dictionary O Thesaurus

×







RECEIVED

MAY 3 0 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

ADVERTISEMENT

Home - Fun & Games - Translator - Word of the Day - Help

Get the Top 10 Most Popular Sites for "finger cots"

Powered by Ask Jeeves

No entry found for finger cots.

44 suggestions found:

fancier

fancywork

fence rail

fencer

fencer's mask

fenugreek

fenugreek seed

fine-grained

finger

finger alphabet

finger bowl

finger cymbals

finger food

finger grass

finger hole



finger millet

finger painting

finger plate
finger wave
fingerboard
fingerbreadth
fingered
fingerflower
fingering
<u>fingerless</u>
fingerlike
<u>fingermark</u>
<u>fingernail</u>
fingerpaint
fingerpost
fingerprint
fingerprint expert
fingerprint man
fingerprint specialist
fingerprinting
finger-roll
fingerroot
finger's breadth
fingerspelling

fingerstall

fingertip

finisher

Finno-Ugrian

Finno-Ugric

For better results, try our search tips.

Try your search for "finger cots" at:

- Amazon.com Shop for books, music and more
- <u>AskJeeves.com</u> Get the top 10 most popular sites
- <u>Electric Library</u> Search thousands of newspapers and magazines
- Google Search the Web for relevant results
- Google Groups Search Usenet messages back to 1981
- Merriam-Webster Search for definitions
- Overture Search the Web
- Roget's Thesaurus Search for synonyms and antonyms

Copyright © 2002, Lexico LLC. All rights reserved. Contacts | Privacy Statement | Terms of Use | Help